

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No: 10/604,129  
Docket No.: 10963-US-PA

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on May 18, 2005. The Office Action rejected claim 1 and 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ejima et al. (US Patent No. 5,873,468) in view of Matsuda et al. (US Patent No. 6,096,808) and further in view of Iwamoto (US Patent No. 5,950,836).

Claims 1, 3-11 remain pending of which claim 1 has been amended to more explicitly and more clearly describe the claimed invention, and claims 5-6 and 8-9 have been amended to correct editorial errors. Claims 12-17 are newly added. It is believed that no new matter is added by way of these amendments made to the claims or specification or otherwise to the application.

After carefully considering the remarks set forth in this Office Action and the cited references, Applicants respectfully submitted that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection are requested.

#### Discussion of Office Action Rejections

*The Office Action rejected claim 1 and 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ejima et al. (US Patent No. 5,873,468, Ejima hereinafter) in view of Matsuda et al. (USP 6,096,808, Matsuda hereinafter) and in further view of Iwamoto et al. (USP 5,950,836, Iwamoto hereinafter).*

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No: 10/604,129  
Docket No.: 10963-US-PA

Applicants respectfully submit that Ejima in view of Matsuda and further in view of Iwamoto are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 1 or 9 unpatentable.

The present invention teaches in claim 1, among other things, ‘...*a plurality of attaching elements, wherein the two ends of each attaching element are inserted into any of the corresponding cannellures on two opposing interior lateral surfaces to partition the interior of the box into compartments of various sizes for accommodating panels of various sizes concurrently...*’. Claim 9 had been amended in the previous response as an independent claim to recite, among other things, “*a plurality of attaching elements, wherein the two ends of each attaching element are inserted into any of the corresponding cannellures of the two opposing interior lateral surfaces, and one of the lateral surfaces of the attaching elements has a plurality of protruding edges such that any pair of the neighboring protruding edges constitutes a slot for accommodating a panel*”.

Contrary to the Office’s assertion, Ejima does not teach or suggest at least the above features in claims 1 and 9, specifically the feature of “*two ends of each attaching element are inserted into any of the corresponding cannellures on two opposing interior lateral surfaces*”. Instead, Ejima teaches a presser member 22 comprising a plurality of protruded elements that can mount to the supporting ribs 21A of the wafer carrier 21. For the presser member to be properly mounted to the wafer carrier 21, each protruded element must be inserted, in order, to a corresponding supporting rib 21A on the wafer carrier 21. Therefore, each of the protruded elements of Ejima (or attaching elements) can not be asserted into any of the corresponding

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No: 10/604,129  
Docket No.: 10963-US-PA

supporting ribs as asserted by the Office. Accordingly, the Office's assertion that "the thin-plate presser members are already inserted into cannellures satisfies the recitation that is any of the corresponding cannellures" is unsubstantiated.

Further, even if each protruded element of Ejima can be construed as comparable to the attaching element of the instant case, and the two ends of the protruded element can assume to be inserted into the corresponding cannellures of two opposing interior lateral surfaces of the box, Ejima still fails to teach one of the lateral surfaces of the attaching elements (or protruded element) has a plurality of protruding edges such that any pair of neighboring edges constitutes a slot for accommodating a panel as taught in claim 9. In fact, the lateral surface of the protruded element of Ejima is precluded from having protruding edges because the insertion direction of panels is parallel to the extension direction of the protruded element, whereas the insertion direction of panels of the instant case is perpendicular to the extension direction of the attaching element. Therefore, the prior art references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 9 of the present invention.

The Office further alleges that Matsuda teaches a panel carrier comprising a box where the compartments are of various sizes in Fig 4 (ref 18). Applicant, however, again respectfully disagrees. Matsuda simply teaches a hollow frame cassette that can only house substrates of one size at a time. However, claim 1 clearly recites that the present invention provides a panel carrier wherein the interior of the box is partition into compartments of various sizes for accommodating panels of various sizes concurrently. In other words, the panel carrier of the

Customer No.: 31361  
Application No: 10/604,129  
Docket No.: 10963-US-PA

present invention can store panels of various sizes at one time. Therefore, Matsuda definitely fails to teach the present invention in this regard. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's contention that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a liquid crystal panel carrier comprising a box where the attaching element partitions the interior of the box into compartments of various sizes...". Applicant respectfully submits to the Office that unsupported statements that aspects of invention are "basic knowledge" or "common sense" are generally insufficient to satisfy the substantial evidence standard.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts even Ejima is combined with Matsuda and Iwamoto, the combination still fails to render claim 1 or 9 of the present invention unpatentable. Since claims 3-8, 10-11 are dependent claims, which further define the invention recited in claims 1 and 9, respectively, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively requested.

#### Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added claims 12-17 in which claim 12 is written in independent form, combining the features that interior surfaces of the box comprises a plurality of lateral surface cannellures and a plurality of bottom cannellures; and a plurality of attaching elements inserted into some of the corresponding lateral surface cannellures on two opposing interior lateral